

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 have been cancelled. New claims 21-28 are at issue. The claims have been amended to overcome a double patenting rejection in the co-pending application Serial No. 09/998,355 filed November 20, 2001.

Claims 21-28 are believed to be allowable over the prior art previously cited in the above-identified patent application as follows.

Claims 21-23 are believed to be allowable because none of the cited references discloses a deformable dome overlying a touch sensitive surface of an acoustic wave switch wherein the dome in an unactuated position is spaced from the touch sensitive surface of the switch and wherein an acoustic wave absorbing material is disposed between the deformable dome and the touch sensitive surface such that in response to a force acting on the dome, the dome deforms and contacts the absorbing material and the absorbing material contacts the touch sensitive surface of the switch with sufficient pressure to actuate the acoustic wave switch as recited in these claims. As the Examiner previously acknowledged, Blouin does not disclose a feedback mechanism that includes a member that overlies the touch surface and includes a deformable dome. Kambara et al. does not disclose the claimed deformable dome or an acoustic wave absorbing material disposed between the deformable dome and the touch sensitive surface such that in response to a force acting on the dome, the dome deforms and contacts the absorbing material and the absorbing material contacts the touch sensitive surface of the switch with sufficient pressure to actuate the acoustic wave switch as required by claims 21-23. The panel 21 of Kambara is not deformable and thus cannot be the claimed deformable dome. In particular, Kambara et al. at col. 3, lns. 23-28 describes the panel 21 as "a curved panel such as a

typical cathode-ray tube.” Cathode-ray tube panels are not deformable but are rigid panels. As such, the panel 21 of Kambara does not teach the deformable dome. Moreover, none of the cited references teaches an acoustic wave absorbing material disposed between a deformable dome and the touch sensitive surface of an acoustic wave switch such that in response to a force acting on the dome, the dome deforms and contacts the absorbing material and the absorbing material contacts the touch sensitive surface of the switch with sufficient pressure to actuate the acoustic wave switch. Because the cited prior art does not teach the elements of claims 21-23, alone or in combination, these claims are believed to be allowable.

Claims 24-28 recite a feedback mechanism for an acoustic wave switch comprising an actuator overlying the touch sensitive surface of the acoustic wave switch and having an acoustic wave absorbing material mounted on the actuator wherein the acoustic wave absorbing material is spaced from the touch sensitive surface of the acoustic wave switch when the actuator is in an unactuated position and wherein the acoustic wave absorbing material contacts the touch sensitive surface of the switch actuating the acoustic wave switch in response to a force acting on the actuator to move the acoustic wave absorbing material into actuating contact with the touch sensitive surface of the acoustic wave switch. None of the previously cited references, Blouin, Kambara, Jaeger or McLoone discloses an acoustic wave absorbing material mounted on an actuator that overlies a touch sensitive surface of an acoustic wave switch wherein the acoustic wave absorbing material is spaced from the touch sensitive surface of the acoustic wave switch when the actuator is in an unactuated position as recited in claims 24-28. Moreover, none of these references teach such a spaced acoustic wave absorbing material wherein the acoustic wave absorbing material contacts the touch sensitive surface of the switch actuating the acoustic wave switch in response to a force acting on the actuator to move the acoustic wave absorbing material

into actuating contact with the touch sensitive surface of the acoustic wave switch as required by claims 24-28. As such claims 24-28 are believed to be allowable.

Because none of the cited references teach the invention set forth in claims 21-28, these claims are believed to be allowable. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 5, 2005

By Jean Dudek Kuelper
Jean Dudek Kuelper

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street
34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
(312) 775-8000